

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action dated July 22, 2002. As a matter of review, Claim 10 was previously cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 - 9 are currently pending. The claims have been amended to more particularly define Applicants' invention. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is found on 6, line 1 and page 7, line 16 - 22 of the instant application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph:

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. With regard to Claim 1 the Examiner asserts that *"the term 'components' is used by the claim to mean 'separate regions or a mixture of compositions containing different components' while the accepted meaning is a 'constituent part' "*.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 1 and 5. Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines the term "component" as *"a constituent part: INGREDIENT"*. Webster's also defines "component" as *"serving or helping to constitute"*. Webster's defines the term "constitute" as *"to make up (the element or elements of which a thing, person, or ideas is made up): FORM, COMPOSE"*.

The term "component" as used in Claims 1 and 5 of the present invention refers to a constituent part (i.e.; an ingredient of or a part of) the detergent composition of the present invention. Hence, Applicants' use of the term "component" is not repugnant to the usual meaning of that term. Thus, as the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is overcome, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection and allow the claims in the instant invention.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 - 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. (U.S. 4,321,157). It is the Examiner's view that Example IV in column 21 of Harris et al. teaches a granular laundry detergent prepared by spraying liquid ingredients onto the solid ingredients having a composition comprising 5% alkylbenzene sulfonate, 53% zeolite, and 22% TAED. The Examiner further asserts that $M=0$ in this composition.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 - 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Cheng (U.S. 4,414,130). It is the Examiner's view that Cheng teaches a readily disintegrable agglomerate detergent composition wherein " $M = 0.10$ ". The Examiner cites Example 6 in column 20 of Cheng to support this assertion.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 - 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Donoghue (WO 98/01520). It is the Examiner's view that Donoghue teaches detergent agglomerates comprising a mixture of particles wherein $M=0.58$. The Examiner cites Example 1 on page 12 of Donoghue to support his position.

The claims as amended overcome the Examiner's rejections. With regard to the cited references, neither Harris, Cheng, nor Donoghue teach Applicants' claimed invention as amended (i.e.; an aluminosilicate builder and an anionic surfactant wherein inter alia the aluminosilicate builder is in crystalline form and wherein the composition is phosphate-free and free of additional silicate).

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2 and 4 - 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. '130. It is the Examiner's view that it would have been obvious to include an effervescent system in the composition of Cheng et al. and so render the claims at hand obvious.

The claimed invention as amended by Applicants overcomes the Examiner's obviousness rejection for the reasons discussed above.


Hence, as the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection and allow the claims of the instant application.

SUMMARY

This is a response to the Examiner's Office Action dated July 22, 2002. A two-month extension of time is requested to respond to this Office Action. Please charge any fees associated with this to Deposit Account No.: 16-2480. For informational purposes, this response is being filed on Monday December 23, 2002. Since December 22, 2002 fell on a Sunday, this response is being timely filed within the two-month extension of time period. The Examiner's rejections of the instant application under 35 U.S.C. §112, 35 U.S.C. §102, and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been overcome. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these rejections and allow the claims in the instant application. No new matter is added.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: Richard T. Hartshorn et al.

BY:


Julia A. Glazer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

December 23, 2002
Cincinnati, Ohio